UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Unmounted Knight - - *J. Ray Shute*

Freedom Means a Constant Struggle - - - - - - - - - - *Eleanor Roosevelt*

Problems and Prospects of Liberal Advance - - - - - - - - *Edwin T. Buehrer*

Healing the Humanist-Theist Controversy - - - - - - - - - *Henry N. Wieman*

Odyssey of a "Free-Luncher" - - - - - - - - - - - - *Burrell B. Burke, Jr.*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXL No. 2

Chicago, May-June, 1954

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly
Except During July-August

Subscription $1.50
Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

Eleanor Roosevelt: First Lady of the Land.

J. Ray Shute: Editorial writer, *The Christian Register.*

Henry N. Wieman: Professor of Philosophy, University of Houston.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 19

ARTICLES—

The Unmounted Knight—J. Ray Shute 20

Freedom Means a Constant Struggle—Eleanor Roosevelt 22

Problems and Prospects of Liberal Advance—Edwin T. Buehrer 24

Healing the Humanist-Theist Controversy—Henry N. Wieman 26

Odyssey of a "Free-Luncher"—Burrell B. Burke, Jr. 28

POETRY—

The Lifted Heart—Brent Dow Allinson 23

THE STUDY TABLE—

Important New Books—C. A. Hawley 30

CORRESPONDENCE—

Morain Replies to Marley—Lloyd Morain 30

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 31

THE FIELD—

Investigations—Devere Allen 18

THE FIELD

Investigations

It is not very hard, I am afraid, to find writers who put things better than this one. For that reason, I want to do some borrowing, and quote in this place from a number of sources which have recently issued comments on some extremely important questions.

Congressional investigating committees have often been criticized for unfair methods. Just how incredibly bad they are has been stated by the conservative New York attorney, Charles C. Parlin, whose firm, because of principles at stake, undertook to serve as counsel to Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Of the Oxnam hearings, Mr. Parlin writes, in *The Methodist Christian Advocate* for April 22: "From a prepared agenda kept secret from the bishop and myself, the bishop was questioned for over ten hours—not primarily on the items about which he had complained (and it is well to remember he requested the hearing to clear the record) but on new items, one dating as far back as 1923. The 'investigating committee' . . . apparently assumes that the 'witness' is subversive. Then, put under oath, he is subjected to questioning based on surprise, apparently in an attempt to trick him into an admission or to catch him off his guard.

"He is not faced by his accusers; his counsel is not allowed to speak; the 'witness' cannot be questioned by his own counsel so as to bring out another side. Loose, untested, and often irresponsible charges are spread upon the record and circulated. . . . Some of the statements (in the files) are absolute misstatements of facts. Some are half-truths. Some are garbled quotations. . . . Sometimes persons of ill will have been able to send things in for the files, receive back the items as official releases of 'information from the files of the House Committee on un-American Activities,' and distribute them as such."

Time after time, officials and citizens have been pilloried, not because of disloyalty or harm to the country, but because they made what now appear as errors of judgment. Condemnation before popular opinion because of such mistakes is not an American tactic, but a well-known Communist principle . . .

DEVERE ALLEN.
Worldover Press.

UNITY

Volume CXL MAY-JUNE, 1954 Number 2

EDITORIAL

The McCarthy-Army hearing in Washington has given the TV industry what is perhaps its most dramatic show. The cost to the TV industry has undoubtedly been great, but the cost to the reputation of our processes of Government both in this country and throughout the world has been incalculable. It seems incredible that a mediocre Senator could acquire sufficient power to upset the processes of Government, and with impunity blast the reputations of high officials of his own party. Perhaps there are compensating values, including the pin-pointing of constitutional problems relating to the traditional division of powers, and particularly in focusing attention on the McCarthy character with resulting loss to his reputation. Many weaknesses of congressional hearings have also been brought to light, including the lack of power to confine testimony to relevant matters. Some of the most dramatic scenes had nothing to do with either the charges or counter-charges. On the whole, the minority members of the committee showed good abilities. The chairman, Senator Mundt, was in general fair, but he could not at times avoid revealing his bias toward the McCarthy side of the issues. Senator Potter was in the main fair, but he revealed no great ability as a statesman. His outstanding remark was that he had never before known of a committee that had to subpoena itself to get its own records. Senator Dworshak took little part in the proceedings. Senator Dirksen was the power behind the 4-3 decisions, and was frankly and openly pro-McCarthy. Of the witnesses, Secretary Stevens deserves special credit for standing up admirably under long and merciless grueling for some eleven days. Adams was a brilliant witness. Cohn exhibited brilliance as a witness, and a measure of fairness toward the opposition. McCarthy was a poor witness. He was hesitant, of poor memory, and inclined to make speeches about irrelevant matters. The Army officers who appeared acquitted themselves well. Attorney Jenkins did an outstanding job in his dual capacity of prosecutor and attorney for the defense. Attorney Welch showed good legal ability, as well as outstanding dramatic qualities. Perhaps never before has a U. S. Senator taken such a well-deserved public castigation as Mr. Welch gave Senator McCarthy in the Fisher affair. In earlier days nothing but a challenge to a duel could have saved the face of the Senator. Happily there is no modern way in which the Senator can save face in that affair. It is to be hoped that the Administration has now learned that it cannot play with fire and not be burned. The Flanders' motion to revive the 1952 charges against McCarthy puts the entire Senate on the spot. The whole affair should, and I hope will, result in removing McCarthy and McCarthyism from public life in America. And if this is the result, the cost of the McCarthy-Army hearing will not be too great.

Curtis W. Reese.

The Unmounted Knight

J. RAY SHUTE

When I was Lay Leader of a Methodist District I recall one Presiding Elder saying he did not want Stewards who would not stew or Laymen who would not lay. Well, naturally, in the Unitarian church we do not have Stewards. The Unitarian Layman, however, is an institution. Upon him rests the responsibility of keeping the church going. He does a swell job, too, as a general rule. In our liberalism, most fortunately, we find that laymen and ministers both put on their britches the same way; they seem to think alike, if not as often, and generally the one is as religious as the other, if not more so. So having about everything in common except their wives and real estate, they approach problems somewhat similarly.

I have found ministers very easy to talk to; and I have found laymen easy to talk to. If I had my "druthers", I'druther talk to the Alliance. The American Unitarian Youth is too practical and intellectual for me, please believe me. I shall never forget that sweet young thing who came up to me after a pulpit address and said: "May I have a copy of your talk? I want to see what you really said." I am not quite sure if she was reflecting on my southern brogue or insulting me to my teeth. I still worry about that. But, seriously, it is so very difficult for me to adequately express my love for liberalism and, at the same time, exhort my liberal *fratres* to manifest and exhibit a genuine altruism for others. This has bothered me a great deal in the past few years.

Perhaps it would not be unfair or untrue to say that liberals generally are rich in intelligence and concern but bankrupt in love. We show an unusual amount of real intellect in analyzing sociological problems; we demonstrate a genuine concern for the underprivileged and those against whom society discriminates; however, if we are honest, we are forced to admit that we lack the actual altruism to put our arms about the masses and to meet them on their own level as brethren and jointly work out the problems besetting mankind. As a matter of fact it is seriously in question whether or not we have lost the art of communicating with the masses. This is a serious indictment, to be sure, but one which should challenge us today as never before in our history. People must never become invisible.

The popularity of the evangelical religions results primarily from their ability to communicate effectively with people in the mass. This is not an art that liberals have lost; as a fact, we have never possessed it. We fall back upon the cliché that liberalism is qualitative and not quantitative, but one is forced to bring into serious question the validity of the assertion. It certainly is not impossible to have emotionalism in liberalism, if that is a weak joint in our armor; however, we are by no means prepared to say that emotionalism is at the core of communication. Expression, familiar terminology, common interests, the development of comradeship,—all of these things aid the art of communication.

The Democratic Party lost the art of communication and with it the election. America is losing the art and with it friends throughout the world. This is not to say that all of the problems in the world today are semantic; but many most assuredly are. We can say, without much fear of contradiction, that the majority of our problems are institutional. And if that be true, then whoever develops the greatest proficiency in the art of communication will stand the best chance of winning friends.

We cannot lose sight of a basic aspect of communication: the physical act. Point IV for example is the most effective medium of communication we have at our disposal and if this is used wisely, honestly, quickly, and to the proper degree, we can be sure that the idea of altruism will be adequately communicated. To most of us this assumption is elementary. However, all people do not share this assumption. A short while ago I listened in utter amazement to a reputable economist who addressed the Unitarian Laymen's League of All Souls' Church, Washington. He stated that Point IV was a fallacy of the first magnitude; that the problem confronting the Eisenhower administration was not how to gain friends, but how to secure allies!

This particular school of thought finds its centrality of commitment and rallying point around the First National Bank. It is the same group that holds to the distorted view of history that there is in fact an economic law of supply and demand which possesses a validity of an infallible nature. Notwithstanding the fact that my university major was in the field of economics, I reject emphatically the idea that any such law has ever had validity either ethically or economically. It is an outmoded laissez faire cliché that belongs to the same museum category as the Biblical admonition that to him who hath shall be added unto and to him who hath not shall be taken away from. While we are in agreement that the goal of the balanced economic order is full employment and maximum production, at the same time a new aspect has been added by our sociologists: adequate distribution and consumption. This means that there exists a demand which should be supplied even in the absence of the wherewithal to provide payment therefor. In short, demand should be considered in terms of need rather than in terms of ability to pay. So long as there are people in the world who are hungry there is a demand for food and the supply and distribution should be met, if it is not met then we are in short supply to that extent. The same may be said of clothing, medicine, housing, education, sanitation, and political franchise. The cooperative economy must replace the competitive one, *within the framework of democratic and representative government.* It can and should be done.

And to that modern school of thought that seeks monetary stability and allies in the upcoming World War III we might offer this rather sound economic advice: it would be much less expensive to feed the hungry people of the world than to attempt to annihilate them with bullets and bombs. The best guaranty of inflation, instability, continued deficit spending, and ultimate moral and financial bankruptcy and chaos is the continuing methodology which necessarily and inevitably leads to war. To be sure this is an answer, but be persuaded it is most assuredly the wrong answer. No basic problem has ever been solved through recourse to war, and our present world problem will not be solved on that wise. If we have learned no other lesson from this century's wars, we have at leas' learned that wars produce no victors—only victims.

An interesting aspect of the art of communication is our manner of communicating to the world our reaction to conditions at home. Spending fifty billion dollars a year on the preparation for war, it is obvious to every one that we need to conserve our manpower, our raw materials, our dollars—hence the need for economic controls to accomplish this. But we rebel against controls, exerting political pressure for repeal of The Defense Production Act. We all know the prices will go up even as we argue they will not. The week that price controls were lifted on cigarettes the price was advanced a penny a pack on this non-essential item. No one got hot and bothered about this. After all, who objects to an extra penny? Well, this extra penny per pack for cigarettes cost our people the tidy increase of two hundred million dollars per year—enough to operate the Office of Price Stabilization for a decade. Does this make sense to any one? This is a method of communicating to the world the seriousness with which we view the world economic crisis. One wonders what those countries now receiving a pittance of Point IV dollars think of our voluntarily puffing up in inflation smoke alone nearly as much as we are spending annually on Point IV? Does it follow, in their logical thinking, that we make such choices willingly and knowingly? These are factual things we must reflect upon as we look on library shelves, in school classrooms, and under our beds for Communists. We are creating situations of weakness on the home front which are well calculated to do us harm on the world front. We contribute freely the means whereby the spread of Communism is rapidly assured. Without our help, the Red cause would suffer greatly. Our campaign to sew the seeds of suspicion, fear, distrust, and hate will produce a harvest of hell. We have so quickly forgotten what it was we were fighting a decade ago—an evil equally as damnable as what we are fighting now. Let it be said once and for all: we do not have to trade the devil for his witch; we do not have to make one of the two choices; things are *not* either white or black. There are other choices, the best of which is *not* the police state, benevolent dictatorship, mother church, or any other authoritarian choice. We can, and indeed should, choose democracy. Until we demonstrate to the world our belief in democracy here at home we can hope for scant success in exporting it abroad. We have too long been criticized for exporting our seconds, our inferior merchandise abroad. So, we can hope to export to the far-flung reaches of this globe only our best, our first run and premium commodities. Thus, if we seek customers we must guarantee our product to be exactly as advertised and when we list democracy it must be the real article, no substitute.

Our democracy has undergone many changes; some of these changes are disquieting. We hope the new-found religion of big business is not the "old time religion" but a new religion which pays more than lip service to ethical and moral formulations. This will be needed in the months and years ahead. We also hope that the President's statement that our fight is against atheistic materialism has no McCarthy connotations. We are not interested in holy wars because no war can be holy. We question drives in the name of 100 per cent Americanism, because it smacks of authoritarian measures. We do not want a police state even if we call it American or democratic. We do not want our libraries, universities, public schools, and news media controlled—even in the name of democracy. We do not want to pay tribute to demagogues or dictators. We know that freedom should mean freedom to differ. We welcome differing opinions—they are healthy and helpful.

The role of the liberal in these smoggy days is rugged. In a time when the term "egghead" assumes acceptability as an antonym of "blockhead," one is not at any loss whatever in placing in proper perspective the trend of the times. The characters seen moving across the current stage in passing review are ham actors, without the eggs. Through demagoguery and pressure they have elbowed the legitimate actors into the wings. The role of the hams is as disgusting as it is alarming. Americans do not have to buy tickets to this flop performance, regardless of the false billing the show is now receiving. Actors, particularly the hams, cannot perform to empty seats—this we know. The answer is clear.

We once conceived the spread of information to be the answer to the problem of communication with the masses. The coming of the movies, radio, television, and the accelerated press were the media to bring enlightenment and a new freedom to the masses. How naive we were and are! Our basic assumption was that the forces of education, progress and democracy would utilize these media in a salutary effect upon the people. Little did we dream that control of these media by the reactionary forces of our age would result in the distortion of public information into propaganda, thereby accelerating the process of misinformation. In short our guns have been captured and turned against us. Our ally has become our enemy, no less. Communication has not been interrupted; it has been put under a censorship control, so to speak, and ceases to be communication. It has become indoctrination and propaganda. Perhaps, at the moment, this is not a fair statement—let us say communication is *becoming* the art of control. The point at issue is that what was once our strongest weapon is in the process of becoming our most destructive opposition.

To control the people it is first necessary to control the mass media of information. This, obviously, is elementary. It is also the fundamental reason why freedom-loving people must everlastingly fight against all efforts to invade and subjugate our schools, libraries, and media of information. The blueprint rapidly unfolding in America is by no means unique—as a matter of fact it is as familiar as it is to be expected. All authoritarians must, of necessity, follow the same pattern. To enforce thought control one must first use fear techniques, then gain control of the media of information; the rest is easy. It is also damnably familiar.

The liberal who gives an inch anywhere along the line betrays the genius of the liberal tradition and weakens the wall against the enemy. Knowing we shall be granted no quarter, we then should neither ask nor expect any. There is no compromise in the area of freedom and democracy. We either have it or we do not have it. We can and should be tolerant of everything except intolerance. Here we must draw the line. The old and false cliché that we can morally justify the temporary surrender of values in order to ultimately preserve them is as uncouth as it is untrue. The validation of such a thesis is impossible in rational and pragmatic thinking. In my humble opinion the prevalent justification of undesirable means to secure desirable ends is a destructive methodology as ancient as time

and as spurious as Satanic promises. In my opinion we can never justify obfuscation of national issues and misleading the people with popular slogans. In my book the technique is illegitimate and Congressional sanction has no more infallible connotation in connection therewith than did the papal blessing have upon the Inquisitors General.

Shortly after the new Congress was sworn in we read in our newspapers that approximately 90 per cent of the House members expressed a desire to be on investigating committees. This argues well for legislative "druthers," no? The will to investigate is a mid-century phenomenon. It brings to mind the familiar story which recently went the rounds. Two friends attended a vaudeville performance, on the program of which were billed the entertaining dogs. When the curtain went up a large dog was seated at the piano accompanying a small dog who sang all of the popular songs. Needless to say the act went over big. On the way out of the theatre one of the friends remarked to the other: "Bill, I don't want to disillusion you, but that small dog wasn't actually singing." The other friend raised an eyebrow. "No," continued the first, "you see, the big dog is a ventriloquist."

Since the order of the day is to discredit liberals of every kind, it would, perhaps, be irrelevant to enter here on the record that we Americans would do well to re-read the inaugural address delivered a score of years ago by a young liberal. He said, in another day of despair: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." It was my privilege to hear the original words. I believed them then; I believe them now. We followed that young dreamer, with his legs of steel and his heart of gold, and made our way out of that valley of despair on to the mountain of hope. We made that journey safely—yes, even grandly—and the reason that we were successful was because of the confidence of most of the people in our venture. We were neither afraid nor suspicious of our fellow Americans. Many mistakes were made on that journey, but as we now look about us we must confess, if we are honest, that we have nostalgic longings for the "good old days." Maybe we will one day have different views of the current "crusade," when the spires of the holy city are a bit more visible through the dust presently being raised by the hoofbeats of the chargers upon which our knights in shining armor are mounted. On second sight, methinks, all of the chargers are not horses; meseems, one discerns the elongated auricular appendages of several of Balaam's equines in the host.

As we continue in this cyclo-ceramic age we should not lose our poise, our equilibrium. Our sense of humor has saved us much heart-break in the past and it will be a good shield in the future. As a matter of communication, we could do a great deal to alleviate our current woes if we used this art proficiently. The demagogue expects opposition, criticism, abuse, and profanity—these are his stock in trade. But one thing he cannot tolerate is laughter—he can literally be laughed out of court. Make a joke of the bigot and he withers away. At the moment our cartoonists could perform a meritorious service to the cause of democracy if, like Herblock, they would "do their stuff." The same is true of the comic strip artists. This is a powerful and a most effective weapon. Make a court jester out of the demagogue and he cracks—he simply cannot take it. And most of these glamor boys today are second-rate clowns. When we make them conscious of that fact, they will not be with us for long. Wholesome laughter is too clean for them. The fine art of communication may yet be developed by the liberal. It may take the funnies to do the trick, but it needs to be done.

Freedom Means a Constant Struggle*

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

When we think of all the efforts made in the United Nations to write a covenant on freedom of information, we realize it is very difficult to get a meeting of minds on what you really mean by freedom of information and on what you really want to achieve.

There is censorship in many parts of the world, and there are different kinds of censorship. We have censorship, too, in this country. It is not a government censorship, but censorship we certainly do have.

Perhaps what we need to do is to examine ourselves as citizens and ask whether today we are doing our job, in every area, of trying to keep freedom and justice. Always before, the people of this country have held to freedom as one of our main objectives. But not long ago I was reading the history of twenty-five years' work by the American Civil Liberties Union, and it brought home to me something I had almost forgotten. It made me stop and realize that civil rights, freedom, justice, have to be fought for all the time.

We talk as if we had these rights from the very beginning. As a matter of fact we have fought for them every step of the way. Only, we tend to forget how much we had to fight, how slowly we made gains, and how easily they can be lost. The minute things seem simple and quiet, we are delighted to fold our hands and close our minds and say everything's all right in the best of possible worlds and we don't have to do anything.

It is in reading the history of what has actually happened in this country through twenty-five years of fighting for civil liberties that one is reminded of the fact that we are not in any different situation today from what we have been in, many times before. The chief difference is that for some strange reason it seems to take a little more to arouse us, and leaders seem a little more difficult to find.

Quite seriously it seems to me that we need a very rude awakening. We have had threats of the present kind before, and we have, I think, sometimes just waited for the hand of the Lord to rid us of our difficulties. I believe that one of the things that has happened to us is that we have grown too accustomed to using words we thought were very serious words, but words which have been used so commonly they have become almost meaningless.

*Mrs. Roosevelt's article is adapted from a speech made recently at a dinner on "Freedom and Responsibility of the Press," celebrating Worldover Press's 20th anniversary.

Nowadays, people are called "traitors," you are told that something is "treason," and that's all—it stops right there and nobody pays any attention. You just accept it as so many words, which don't mean anything any more. You find the head of a Judiciary Committee in the Senate actually bringing out charges against the head of the Supreme Court, charges which when looked at with reason are so utterly foolish and picayune and ridiculous you wonder, if they were brought against some small individual in a little local election, would they be believed, would anybody pay attention to them? And yet they are brought forth by the head of a responsible committee about a Chief Justice of the United States.

It is incredible what we will accept, without a real revolution—not in action, but in our minds. Finally we have reached the point where one part of our government appears to have capitulated to another part. When Senator McCarthy made his attack on the Secretary of the Army, I confess I had thought the Secretary was going to do a simple thing—go before the Committee and say: "I have come to protest against the manner in which these hearings are conducted. And particularly against the overstepping of authority." It is quite obvious, I think, that the Army had something to conceal in this particular case. But it was up to the Army to consider it and make changes if they were necessary. There was certainly no excuse for browbeating someone who was doing what it was his duty to do. I felt that it would be good for us all to have the issue clarified, and have it made plain that the purpose of Congressional committee investigations was to get information for legislation, and not repeat some of the abuses that have lately been so common.

Now I hope that at last the people of the country have been awakened to the fact that there comes a time when they must take individual responsibility for making their voices heard. There are times when the voice of the people is essential, to convince those in legislative and administrative posts of what the people want. And this is one of the cases when our newspapers, it seems to me, at least those I have been reading, are actually seeking out the facts and revealing what a great many of our people think.

There are others, of course, who feel differently and speak differently. But by and large over the country, we as individuals have a responsibility to register the fact that freedom and justice are two things we are determined to keep in our nation. Now is the time to say it in every way we possibly can, and make our weight felt as citizens throughout the country. I have sometimes wondered how we were going to act in the present situation of growing fear. It was a terrible thing to see the people of a great nation being frightened, to look in vain for any real understanding of charges and issues, to accept what was said to them without any effort to discover what it was in their power to do. I hope that these recent events may make us realize that fear never leads to sound judgment. That fear never finds the right answers.

I do not like Communism. I have had contacts with people who had to act under Communist governments, and I have frequently wondered how they could stand facing themselves. What you come to recognize and what you fear under Communism is a slavery of the body and of the mind. It is not the difference of systems alone that matters; we can have different systems in the world, and try to resolve those differences in normal ways. But free minds cannot live with, and tolerate, a slavery which obliges you to say things you know are lies. I have seen intelligent, educated men having to do that, and I think this kind of slavery is what we are most afraid of.

But not to understand what you are afraid of is not going to help you fight it. As I have been around this country, I have had some people say to me: "Senator McCarthy is a wonderful person—he showed us the *dangers* of Communism." I have said, "Just what *is* Communism?" Not one in twenty would even try to tell me what they think Communism is. Blindly they have accepted, many of them, the fact that here is something you must fight. But until you know what it is, you aren't going to get anywhere. Or until we have some positive idea that the way to fight it is to believe in freedom and justice and fight for that faith. You have to fight *for* something, not merely say, "I'm afraid of Communism." You have to fight for the traditions and beliefs and ideas that we in this country *say* we believe in and *say* we have been living under, and *say* we have been living to promote.

In Japan I met a professor who remarked to me: "Oh, we think the things you *say* democracy means are wonderful! But in what we read and in what we see, we are not always quite sure you *live* the things you *say*." Such a comment is a bit difficult to answer, especially with what is happening to us at the present time.

I hope that as citizens we shall determine to fight for the values we believe inherent in our life and form of government, fight to have them achieved and maintained, fight to have them understood by all the people of the country as far as our voices and our writings and other means of influencing public opinion can be made to reach.

And I hope that we ourselves will not be intimidated, that we are going to say what we believe in and what we think. If we stand firm, it will be a good day, not for our country alone, but for the world.

The Lifted Heart*

"Let us choose quickly, because the night is coming when we shall no longer have a choice between Life and Death. The heavy feet of the gods of Doom are stamping on the borders of the world."

—Rev. A. Eustace Haydon,
Chicago, Illinois.

My heart leapt up when I beheld
Our jet-planes skim the sky;
So was it when these wars began,
But now it seems the doom of Man
Is written there on high.

In East and West, as all can see
Blind nations hold their breath,
Flexing their power, practicing war
With flying forts that shoot and soar,
Leading a dance with Death!

And Hope comes not to light our fen,
Nor Peace to the brave and free,
Till mightier than the Plane the Pen
Shall write a Compact once again,
Binding land to land in larger loyalty!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

*With apology to William Wordsworth.

Problems and Prospects of Liberal Advance*

EDWIN T. BUEHRER

Years ago, in one of his great books, John Dewey made the observation that the first great science which gripped the imaginations of men was that which dealt with a subject farthest removed from the human scene, namely astronomy, and that the latest science which men have taken hold of seriously was that of the human mind and the emotions, namely, psychiatry. We took that which was farthest away, first, and got around to that which was nearest and most intimate, last.

Biology, too, goes back to the early Greeks, and certain studies which Confucius and other ancients made could be called the forerunners of sociology. But biology came into its own only with Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, Herbert Spencer, and others of the late nineteenth century; and as to sociology—the science of human relations—it required for its development the researches of William Graham Sumner, Franklin Giddings, and Edward A. Ross—contemporaries of men still living.

Psychiatry came into its own with Freud who died in 1939, and along with it, psychosomatics, emphasizing the essential unity or oneness of the psyche, or mind, and the soma, or body; and this is still, as a science, only in its infancy. The same is true of social psychology, which is the scientific study of personal problems in their proper context of social problems. Such books as *Social Pathology, Social Disintegration,* or *Case Studies in Social Psychology* were unknown when people of my age were undergraduates in college; and today, in the ministry, we would hardly know how to get along without such books constantly on our reference shelves.

Now, it is astonishing to think of the technological progress which our generation, and the two or three preceding ours, have seen. Astonishing, that 125 years ago men could travel no faster than could the Romans or the Egyptians or the Babylonians, and that now they can travel hundreds of miles per hour. But it is appalling to think that the major religious notions which still so largely dominate the Western World were formulated while astronomy was still astrology, and all the other sciences which I have mentioned, or might have mentioned, were almost completely unknown. And here we are with the ancient notions, the ancient languages, the ancient symbolism, the ancient mind-set—shades and ghosts of the ancient world view—which religious leaders are still trying with a sort of dogged persistence to perpetuate in our society, and with astonishing success.

Let me try to put this in a more dramatic way. Suppose you take along this table from which I am speaking, a distance of four feet, and let it be a scale of time representing 6,000 years of our human history. It is a span which just about represents the limits of Toynbee's estimate, and beyond which our historical knowledge rapidly fades out. Very well, at the extreme left of this four-foot scale are the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Babylon, India, and China. Leaping halfway across we come to Moses and the Ten Commandments. Towards the two-thirds mark we have the Old Testament Prophets, the Psalms, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, and the Golden Age of Greece. Arriving at the two-thirds mark we have Julius Caesar and the beginning of the Roman Empire—and Jesus. Next we move into the Middle Ages, with Thomas Aquinas and the matured world view of the Catholic Church, six or seven inches from the other end. Halfway through the remaining distance we come upon Columbus and the early settlements of America, and three inches from the end we have the Reformation. Less than two inches from this far end—namely, our end—we have Isaac Newton, John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, and the Age of the Enlightment; and crowded into the last half inch of our contemporary era, we have Darwin's theory of evolution. Here, also, we have bio-chemistry, micro-biology, sociology, psychiatry, social psychology, and all the other crucial studies of man's real place within the context of his natural world.

Not only have we arrived at this last half-inch, with all these human enterprises demanding our intellectual and emotional readjustment, but are warned that the speed-up of our scientific and technological change shows no sign of abating. Precisely what will have to be crowded into that next half inch, or quarter inch, of human history, and what is the role of a religious faith which regards itself as liberal in an age such as this?

I have suggested that the major emphasis of theological thinking still dominating our Western World has its roots far back along the historic scale. Our Unitarian tradition does, of course, tell a somewhat different story. Unitarianism, with its roots far into the past, came upon the scene as a separate movement right upon the heels of the Enlightenment, in the wake of Newton and Spinoza and John Locke. But Unitarianism, since Channing, was itself once almost swallowed up in the great tradition. The reaction against Channing and Parker was immediate, even before Channing's death; and the controversy between the liberals and the conservatives continued through the years. In 1865 the national leaders called upon all Unitarians to drop their controversies, and mutual suspicions, and "devote their united hearts and souls to the positive truth, the positive faith and the positive work of the gospel of Jesus Christ." This in celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the American Unitarian Association. It was the retreat from liberalism which Channing deplored more than twenty years earlier, and which, in a letter to his friend, Dr. Martineau, he called the "new Unitarian orthodoxy" now become even more orthodox.

It is to be remembered, moreover, that the beliefs which Channing and Parker held more than a hundred years ago, would not make them shining liberals today. Radical though they seemed then, their views regarding the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, miracles, and the doctrine of immortality were the accepted views of the Congregational churches out of which they came. I mention this only to suggest that Unitarianism during those forty years was a retreat from the views which their leaders had held even then; and in the convention of 1865 the conservatives won a complete victory. The liberals, among them some of the most promising young intellectuals, felt themselves left out in the cold. Two years later, in Boston, they had a meeting of their own. Emerson spoke, and so did Lucretia Mott; and out of it

*Presidential address delivered April 30, 1954, at the meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference in St. Louis.

came what was known as the *Free Religious Association.* The F.R.A. included such men as, for example, Felix Adler, who later founded the Ethical Society; Octavius Brooks Frothingham, one of the ablest ministers of his time; and Francis E. Abbott, who boldly attacked transcendentalism, preached a scientific theism, and publicly rejected his belief in immortality. It was a varied assortment of people who were determined to save Unitarianism from sinking hopelessly back into Christian orthodoxy.

For several years F.R.A. meetings attracted considerable newspaper attention, and often more than did the rather staid A.U.A. May meetings. They had certain stated purposes, one being to answer the pressing question: What can religious people believe, now that science had undermined all the ancient beliefs? By "science" they meant, primarily, Darwin's theory of evolution, which they read with eager interest, but from which most religious leaders, including not a few Unitarians, recoiled with horror. The F.R.A. purposed, also, to promote a friendlier interest in other world religions, and it undertook to revitalize the religious interest in social reform.

Minot Savage, one of my predecessors in the ministry of The Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, eagerly read Darwin's book, just beginning to stir the waters of controversy, and he preached at least one sermon suggesting that the scientific view of evolution would be a help rather than a hindrance in religious thinking.

The F.R.A. was from the point of view of its own organization a tragic failure. It could not weld its prima donnas together, it could not agree on its own purpose and function, and its members were divided over its social philosophy. Even so, it had a profound influence upon our denomination, and it prepared the way for the Parliament of Religions which was held at the great Chicago Fair in 1893. Eventually it was dissolved, but not until this same Minot Savage introduced an amendment to the by-laws which since 1882 has virtually assured freedom of thought and utterance within Unitarianism. The amendment specifically stated that there was no authoritative test of Unitarianism, and that none would be excluded from its fellowship "who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our purpose and practical aims." With that new element of freedom in the denomination, the basic purpose of the F.R.A. was achieved, and it could be dissolved with honor. Now, too, Channing and Parker could come more positively into their own in our Unitarian tradition.

So, now, with our scientific world view in focus, and our Unitarian principle of freedom fully and unqualifiedly established, what is the present human situation in which we have to preach, practice, and promote our liberal faith? There is at the present time a resurgence of interest in religion. People are asking basic questions, and they want answers that give them some kind of reassurance in believing, and satisfaction in living. Ten years ago church membership was estimated to be about 50 per cent. Since then millions have been swept into the churches, and now the estimate is 55 per cent. If, however, we are excited about our progress toward and beyond the 80,000 mark in membership, and our more than a hundred fellowships, fundamentalists have much more cause for rejoicing. For along with science and technology a phenomenon in our American life is the return to fundamentalist Christianity; witness the success of Billy Graham, Fulton Sheen, and Fulton Oursler. The Nazarene Church in 1906 had a total membership of 6,600. Twenty years later there were 1,400 Nazarene churches, with a total membership of 63,000, and today the membership has soared to a quarter million. Jehovah's Witnesses have enjoyed a similar growth. In their national convention in Cleveland, in 1946, they had 80,000 delegates from all the far-flung places of the United States and Canada.

Along with all this numerical increase, however, there are certain developments peculiar to our times. There is discernible a trend towards secularization. The membership has risen, the total wealth and building power of the churches have increased, there is better administration and supervision, and there is a more expertly trained leadership—both lay and clerical. There is also more literature and it is more attractively edited. Relatively, it is less widely distributed, for whereas the church press once reached about 75 per cent of the population, today the religious reading public is only about 10 per cent. Moreover, many of the most successful religious journals are yielding to the secular trend. The Methodist *Christian Advocate,* for example, and the *Christian Herald* carry far more secular material than they once did, and the Catholic *Commonweal* and the Christian Science *Monitor* are read perhaps more for political and social news and comments than for their religious content.

By the secularization of religion I mean that certain forms and expressions of it are becoming increasingly involved in problems of education, politics, business, the sciences, and the arts—that is to say, the total life—and thus losing its identity as something apart from life. It could mean becoming more humanitarian, more social in outlook, more pervasive, more involved in the total life. As such, religion is both welcomed and it is feared, and there is therefore another trend. When the American poor turn to religion, as many of them are doing, they do not turn to a faith in either evolution, revolution, or social change. They turn, rather, to a more radical revolt against faith in their fellow man. Religious fundamentalism and, it could also be said, moral fundamentalism, is today more than ever a movement of social condemnation and despair. From its point of view man and society are both immoral; and religion becomes for them a faith in something more than human resources—something more than worldly happiness. Despite strong secular trends in some aspects of our religious life, supernaturalism still makes a powerful appeal. It is paradoxical, of course, but it is nevertheless true, that while millions of Christian Americans are using every modern technological device to house and propagate their faith, and to draw upon some of the sciences, even to give their faith certain desired struts and supports, many of the more recently developed social sciences to which I have already referred are just that much worthless trash.

Religious liberalism is under attack, and the attack has come at one and the same time from Christian fundamentalism, neo-orthodoxy, existentialism, and social radicalism. Our enemies have either never known the meaning of religious liberalism, or they have deliberately rejected it. Nevertheless, we know what former items of faith we have discarded, and we know what we still believe. We are aware of new insights and new visions to lift and inspire us, and reassure us in these times of rapid change. For we have accepted change itself as basic in our world structure, and constant

reorientation as necessary to meaningful and purposeful living. The great New Testament scholar, T. R. Glover, in his splendid book, *The World of the New Testament,* says that the first century Christians overcame all the competing religions of the time because they outthought them, outlived them, and outdied them. They were more realistic and forthright in facing up to the problems of their age, they achieved a finer quality of living. Theirs was a sort of moral regeneration; their character and courage marked them as individuals and groups so that they could be identified as men and women to whom something splendid had happened.

I spoke of biological evolution, and what the Darwinian theory did to nineteenth century Unitarians—and they with it. And it is an exciting coincidence that the biological sciences are once again throwing the searchlight on vast and as yet unexplored possibilities of our earthly life and destiny. Ashley Montague, Julian Huxley, George G. Simpson, and others have pointed out that whereas for many living creatures a further biological change is either limited or already stopped, for man the possibilities out ahead are limitless. They point out that whereas nature is red in tooth and claw, nevertheless, within any given species, either animal or human, mutuality in living—living and helping live—is the basic requirement for survival. They indicate that whereas the universe is impersonal—and the process of evolution without purpose—it does reveal certain trends which the human mind can not only discern and explore, but which man can endow with his own purpose. They also agree that, whereas it is essential to know the way we have come, the absorbing emphasis of life is not back to tradition, but "forward beyond tradition."

Here, then, is a demonstration of the resources for "moral and spiritual living" which the modern sciences make increasingly possible for us. More than any other religious people in the world, or in history, we—Unitarians, Universalists, Ethical Culturists—are free to discover and use these insights in the process of bringing to a full and happy expression a faith adequate to our times. Inherent in such a faith is a passionate belief in freedom. Inherent in it, also, is a belief in the preciousness of life. We may recognize this earth as our home, and ourselves as ultimately responsible for its happiness and its peace. Potential in our way of life is a belief in the infinite evolutionary possibilities for both evil and good—with the good as our high hope and ideal.

These are tremendous things to believe. The 45 per cent of unchurched Americans may not all be ready to hear and receive the message of an inspired religious liberalism, but their numbers may one day surprise us. In his *Psychoanalysis and Religion,* Eric Fromm says that what is important is not necessarily belief in God, heaven, or immortality, but rather "living love and truth."

Let us lay our plans on large dimensions. We have heard quoted recently in Chicago, the stirring words of the architect, David Burnham, who designed the buildings for the 1893 World's Fair. In launching that venture Burnham said, "Make no little plans . . . make big plans. . . . Little plans have no magic to stir men's blood." I wish we liberals could launch some really big plans for the promotion of ideas and attitudes that have inspired us. We should make a bolder venture into the possibilities of philosophy, the sciences, and the arts for religious living; we need more effective programs of education and action; we need more effective recruiting of numbers to strengthen our fellowship; we need to look constantly for challenging ideas; and we should be fearful only if they are not venturesome enough.

If you like Walt Whitman you will excuse me for quoting in conclusion from his immortal "Passage to India." Here he sails, not just for India, but beyond—far beyond—into the limitless possibilities of the universe itself. And so he sings:

> Sail forth!
> Steer for the deep waters only, reckless
> O soul, exploring—
> I with thee, and thou with me . . .
> For we are bound where mariner has not yet
> dared to go . . .
> And we will risk the ship, ourselves, and all.

Healing the Humanist-Theist Controversy

HENRY N. WIEMAN

I

Nature of the Controversy

Humanists claim that man himself and he alone by drawing upon his own resources must save himself from self-destructive tendencies and achieve the best that human life can ever attain. Theists claim that man must commit himself to what works as man cannot if he is to be saved from self-destructive tendencies and transformed into the best that human life can ever attain.

Humanists and some theists might enter into cooperative and other mutually helpful relations if they could agree on three points, namely:

A. The problem to be solved by religious inquiry and truth.

B. The area of inquiry where this truth is to be found.

C. The method of inquiry by which this truth is found.

Agreement on these three points can be promoted if we can be clear on the alternatives under each of these three, namely, the problem, the area, and the method. There are four alternative ways of interpreting the problem which concerns religion. These four different ways of understanding the problem lead logically to four alternative views of the area of inquiry and also to four alternative methods of inquiry in dealing with the problem.

If examination of these alternatives should lead to agreement in adopting one of the four to the exclusion of the others, first in our understanding of what the problem is and second in determining the area of inquiry and third in choosing the method, great constructive power might result for liberal religion. This power might grow in thought, in action, and in the numbers who go along with us. To this end and with this hope, let us examine the alternatives.

II

The Alternatives in Controversy

A. Alternative Interpretations of the Religious Problem:

(1) The problem is to find or acknowledge and hold supreme in one's life whatever it is *"beyond the universe"* which creates, sustains, and governs it, with the understanding that this is what must save man from self-destructive tendencies and transform him into the best that human life can ever become when required conditions are met.

(2) The problem is to find or acknowledge and hold supreme in one's life the process going on *within the total cosmos* which is dominant over all other processes, with the understanding that this will save man from self-destructive tendencies and transform him into the best that human life can ever become when the required conditions are met.

(3) The problem is to find or acknowledge and hold supreme in one's life *those beliefs* which best serve to interpret, produce, and defend certain states of consciousness, sometimes called religious experience, these states being peace of mind or bliss or hope and courage or whatever may be the desired state of consciousness, with the understanding that what these beliefs designate will save and transform.

(4) The problem is to find or acknowledge and hold supreme the process going on *in human life* which has such character and power that man must promote it above all else to be saved from self-destructive tendencies and to be transformed into the best that human life can ever become when required conditions are met.

It will be noted that in each of the four alternatives listed, the problem is to find or to acknowledge what will save man from self-destructive tendencies and transform him into the best when required conditions are met. This, I believe, is the most general statement of the religious problem. Distinction is made between "to find" and "to acknowledge" because only a few are engaged in seeking and finding. For the great majority the problem is to acknowledge what their leaders and teachers declare to be the truth. This applies not only to religion but to all the important areas of life, whether in science, medicine, art, politics, or any other. Even the scientist engaged in specialized research can only acknowledge as true what other scientists declare to be the case outside his own field of competence. Therefore, to state the religious problem as one of *finding* alone is a mistake. Furthermore, the religious problem is that of ordering one's life and one's society so far as possible to meet the demands of what is believed to have the saving and transforming power. In the above statements this ordering of one's life and society is called "holding supreme in one's life."

B. Alternative Interpretations of the Area of Inquiry:

(1) The area of religious inquiry is a realm beyond the temporal world because there only can one find the creator and sustainer and ruler of the temporal universe.

(2) The area of religious inquiry is the cosmic whole of things because there only can one find the process which dominates all other processes in the universe.

(3) The area of religious inquiry is the realm of mystery because there only can one find and defend the beliefs required to interpret, produce, and defend the state of consciousness most highly prized.

(4) The area of religious inquiry is the process of human living as it occurs in the development of human personality in interpersonal relations and in society and history, because here only can be found any process going on in human life having the character and power to save and transform.

C. Alternative Interpretations of the Method of Inquiry:

(1) The method of religious inquiry is to interpret some unquestioned authority such as a book, the life and teachings of a God-man, or some tradition, for only in this way can one hope to gain any knowledge of a creator, sustainer, and ruler of the temporal world and all its conceivable possibilities.

(2) The method of religious inquiry is philosophical speculation, for only in this way can one hope to get knowledge of the total cosmic whole of things and the process in the cosmos which dominates this whole.

(3) The method of religious inquiry is intuition and inner conviction subject to the pragmatic test of utility in producing and defending the state of consciousness called religious experience.

(4) The method of religious inquiry is intuition or insight as it occurs in science, common sense, personal relations, and elsewhere, subject to the tests of (a) analysis of experience sometimes called phenomenology and (b) observation, prediction and logical coherence. Only in this way can one hope to find the process going on in human life which has the character and power to save and transform when required conditions are present.

III

How the Humanist-Theist Controversy Might be Resolved

The above survey of the four alternatives under the headings of the problem, the area of inquiry, and the method of inquiry would seem to indicate that the Humanists could never accept the alternatives (1), (2), and (3) under each of the three headings. But the Humanists might well accept alternative (4) under each of the three headings. Also some theists would accept number (4) when theism is interpreted to mean the belief that man is dependent for salvation from self-destructive tendencies and for transformation into the best, not alone on human purposes and strivings but also and preëminently upon a process going on in human life which works at the level of human personality in a way analogous to metabolism at the level of the biological organism. Just as metabolism creates the biological organism and keeps it in health and vitality when man has no knowledge of it and does nothing by intent to promote it, provided that required conditions are present, so also there is a process which creates the human mind and keeps it free of self-destructive conflicts when man has no knowledge of it and does nothing by intent to promote it, provided that required conditions are present.

Theism of the kind just indicated agrees with the Humanists in excluding alternatives (1), and (2) and (3) under the headings, respectively, of the religious problem, the area of inquiry, and the method of inquiry. It also agrees in adopting alternative (4) under each of the headings.

With agreement on the nature of the problem, the area of inquiry, and the method of inquiry, I do not see why there should be anything but mutually helpful relations between Humanism and the kind of theism just described. To be sure, many theists will not agree to accept number (4) to the exclusion of the other three alternatives. They, and perhaps some Humanists, will not join us. But when there is agreement on the nature of the problem, the area of inquiry, and the method of inquiry, controversy should assume the form of mutally helpful criticism and not mutual opposition nor estrangement.

With such agreement I can see great forward strides in religious thinking and in the spread and power of liberal religion. A powerful constructive movement might get under way and religion might assume that place in human life which it must assume if the problems and difficulties of our time are to be met constructively.

Odyssey of a "Free-Luncher"

BURRELL B. BURKE, Jr.

A noted clergyman once referred to those casual visitors who slip unobtrusively into the back pews of churches as "free-lunchers." Yet these casual attendants are sometimes thinking people, who are not satisfied with the faith in which they were brought up, and are seeking something better—some form of religion which will do more to help them solve the many problems of life than the faith to which they have been accustomed.

As one who has often been guilty of such window-shopping for a religion, it seems to me that the so-called "free-luncher" is often in a better position to get an objective picture of the various forms of worship—and of the worshippers also—than the regular church member, most of whom are quite sure that their particular religion is the true and only way to a better life both here and hereafter.

An old country church that I attended as a boy comes to mind. The building was plain and quite weatherbeaten, testifying to the fact that it had seen better days. The pews were hard and uncomfortable, and the ancient reed organ wheezed and panted asthmatically when pumped heroically by the maiden lady who taught the village school. The congregation was largely made up of kindly, hard-working rural people, who were very sincere and deeply devoted to their religion and their church. The Sunday service was a big event to them; one to be discussed all week, in fact, for they lived rather montonous and uneventful lives. Consequently, a great deal of the interest of the community was centered in the village church.

Of course, outsiders who came to the services, while greeted in a friendly manner, were looked upon with some suspicion. This was especially noticed when, after an hour-long sermon, in which every form of entertainment was denounced as "worldly pleasure," the consequences of which could only be eternal damnation and hot hellfire, the "Christians" (those who had renounced these "worldly pleasures" and were following in the straight and narrow way) were asked to stand, and this poor sinner was found sitting amongst the wicked. How the parson would pray and plead, and threaten us "poor lost souls" with hell and damnation, while the choir sang endless verses of "Lord, I'm Coming Home." Alas, I remained a sinner unto the end!

After moving to a larger town, a somewhat different church came in for the same type of observation. This church was strictly middle class, and the people very strait-laced and self-righteous. With a smug, self-satisfied air they would arrive on Sunday morning and, for the most part, sit stiffly through the service, scarcely bowing their heads while the minister invoked the blessing of the Lord on every conceivable object and situation. On and on he prayed until one found it difficult to keep awake. The sermon, too, was long, and delivered with a self-assured, complacent air, as though the preacher possessed all the wisdom of the ages, although he was not above spicing this collection of pious platitudes with bits of local gossip, offered for their moral value, of course!

There was, however, a feeling of friendliness toward the visitor, and a tolerant attitude toward one who was more or less an onlooker. But all this was soon changed when they decided a revival was in order; an evangelist was brought in, and the change in this strait-laced congregation and pompous preacher was a wonder to behold.

The evangelist was one of the most emotional type. He ranted and raved against sin and the devil, denouncing all and sundry in the most extravagant terms, pounding the pulpit with his fist and almost hanging from the chandeliers in his enthusiasm to "win souls for the Lord" as he put it. The people, too, got into the spirit of the thing, singing at the top of their voices, some even clapping their hands. From the beautiful organ, which normally played so sweetly and solemnly of a Sunday morning, came jazz-tunes which Tin Pan Alley might justly claim as its own, with gospel verses to match, of course. Abandoning his high-and-mighty attitude, the preacher, filled with evangelical zeal, came down to plead personally with us poor lost sheep in the back. This "poor lost sheep" hastily departed, though with a feeling of regret, for there were pleasant associations to be left behind. The people of the church, though often impatient with those who did not immediately adopt their religion as the "true faith," seemed always ready to greet the independent worshipper in their midst with a friendly smile and a welcoming handshake. These kindly gestures had come to mean much to one who had often visited there, and it was with a feeling of loss and disappointment that the "free-luncher" bade them a silent farewell and returned no more.

Sometime later, in a large and well-known city, the opportunity for a bit more "religious window-shopping" presented itself. Chosen for this experiment was the largest and most impressive cathedral in the city. It

was certainly a magnificent structure, with an imposing front, on the most fashionable street. The holy figures on the outside were truly works of art, and it was with a feeling of awe that one entered its vast portals. Inside the same atmosphere of splendor and glory prevailed, emphasizing the fact that this was the church of the rich and grand. The ornately-carved altar was surmounted by an enormous golden crucifix, with two great, beautifully-wrought golden candlesticks on either side, in which were what appeared to be candles with electrical devices at the end, giving the impression of a constantly-burning flame. Of course, the better pews were rented to the "first families," (a "free-luncher" was fortunate to find a place to sit in the back, or in the gallery), and even the kneeling benches were covered with a velvet-like material, lest the "silk-stocking" parishioners, who knelt so decorously there, might bruise their delicate knees.

Garbed in richly-embroidered vestments, the priest officiated at the altar, leading this proud and haughty congregation in an elaborate ritual. An observing onlooker could scarcely help wondering, as he heard these purse-proud, society-loving people repeating the meek words of humility and penitence from their Morocco-bound prayer-books, just how sincere they were—how much was honest worship and how much sprang from love of the pomp and pageantry of the ancient ritual.

A questioning soul found even more cause to wonder when, the opening ritual concluded, the priest ascended to the high, carved pulpit and proceeded to deliver his sermon. Though one might admire the rather striking figure this clergyman presented, against such a gorgeous background, the sermon contained not the slightest thought that one might employ in the struggle to solve the problems of life. In fact, the impression was given that no such problems existed. Everything in life is fine, he seemed to say, everything is beautiful, for the Lord made it that way—praise ye the Lord! Amen and Amen! Then the congregation knelt again for more prayers and thanksgiving to the all-wise God, who had entrusted to their capable hands the better things of this world. A final benediction, and the service came to a close. The fashionable ladies gathered their mink coats about them, the gentlemen retrieved their hats and coats, and all moved in stately fashion through the massive doors to the waiting limousines drawn up at the curb below.

As for the seeker, he turned sadly away, for though deeply impressed by the beauty and solemnity of the service, and inspired by the hushed and reverent atmosphere of this lovely house of worship, he could not see the slightest evidence of brotherly love and concern for those less fortunate, in this cold, proud, and ostentatious congregation.

Bitterly disillusioned, the seeker looks back over the experiences of the past. Shall he return to the narrow, self-denying worship of earlier years? Or to the self-satisfied, middle-class form of religion, with only occasional emotional "binges"? Or shall he accept a small corner of the beautiful rich man's church, admire at a distance its pomp and glory, and hope for an insignificant corner of heaven (where even the streets, they say, are paved with gold), from the rich man's God?

One can become weary of searching, for it is a lonely way and the temptation to compromise, to accept the way of the majority and retreat into some safe haven of respectability, is ever present. Then one may strive to become more and more "respectable" and even look down his nose at the poor "free-luncher" who still may be carrying on the search that he abandoned, and still hold those ideals which he traded for a respectable conformity.

Confused by these disappointing experiences, one might even come to doubt the fundamental goodness in human nature, but then an entirely different side of the picture presented itself. During a serious illness there came to my bedside a little old lady I had known for some time. Her kindness, thoughtfulness, and genuine desire to help everyone, whether in sickness, in trouble, or in financial adversity, was a wonderful inspiration to the disillusioned "free-luncher." Quite by accident I found that she had been doing this for years—asking no compensation, receiving no praise, and no public recognition. Far into the night she watched beside the sick, comforted the sorrowing, and when someone was in trouble she always found a way to help, often without the knowledge of those she befriended. Yet she was not known as a religious person. In fact, I doubt if she ever went to church. She had no time; she was too busy practicing what others only preached.

And yet the church has a certain appeal to the human soul, in spite of the hard thoughts one may sometimes have concerning the practice of its humanitarian doctrines. It fills a place in one's life, even in the life of the somewhat cynical onlooker, a place which nothing else can fill. While he may sometimes turn from it in disappointment, even in anger and disgust, the seeking "free-luncher" shall never really leave the orbit of its influence, and in its back pews, often looking on with a critical eye, he shall still be found.

Philosophical Library Publications

AGAINST THE STREAM

By Karl Barth

Ten different pieces are presented here, including the highly significant DOCUMENTS OF A HUNGARIAN JOURNEY (the reception of which, and the ensuing controversy with Emil Brunner, no doubt prompted the author to suggest the English title for the whole volume). From this book it is possible to see the work of the great Swiss Reformed dogmatist against the background of current affairs in Europe. With a frontispiece of the author. $3.75

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

Publishers

15 East 40th St., Desk 617, New York 16, N. Y.

Expedite Shipment by Prepayment

The Study Table

Important New Books

PURITAN SAGA. *Collected Writings of Jonathan Edwards. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. New York: Library Publishers. 640 pp. $5.00.*

IN SPITE OF. *By John Cowper Powys. New York: Philosophical Library. 312 pp. $5:00.*

THE MAN IN LEATHER BREECHES. *By Vernon Noble. New York: Philosophical Library. 298 pp. $6.00.*

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL CUSTOM. *By Burleigh Cushing Rodick. New York: Philosophical Library. 244 pp. $4.75.*

SCIENCE AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR. *By B. F. Skinner. New York: The Macmillan Company. 461 pp. $5.00.*

SOPHOCLES. *By F. J. H. Letters. New York: Sheed and Ward. 310 pp. $4.50.*

Vergilius Ferm, the well-known professor at the College of Wooster, has edited the best known works of Jonathan Edwards. Edwards, born 250 years ago, is still studied and written about. This is the best one-volume edition of his works. John Cowper Powys writes here a series of short essays in his usual crisp and salty style. It was written in his eightieth year. He treats such subjects as Loneliness, Insecurity, and Belief. Vernon Noble in his *Man in Leather Breeches* has written an interesting book on the life and times of the founder of the Quaker movement, George Fox, one of the most remarkable characters of the seventeenth century. This book attempts a new appraisal of the part Fox played in securing freedom of speech and the right to worship God as one pleases. This is an important contribution to Quaker studies. Burleigh Cushing Rodick has written an important study in constitutional custom from the Colonial founders to the time of Thomas Jefferson. He adds a brief comment on the period from Jefferson to Lincoln. In *Science and Human Behavior,* B. F. Skinner has given us a controversial approach to modern psychology. The new approach is its way of looking at central problems in human behavior as it really is, rather than what it appears to be. The author shows how the methods of science can be applied to current problems facing the world today. The volume on Sophocles by Letters is much needed. The book is divided into two parts: part one tells of the age in which Sophocles lived; part two gives an analysis of his great plays. Sophocles, of course, is most rewarding reading. This book brings the great playwright down to the average reader. It is profound and at the same time simple and direct.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Morain Replies to Marley

To UNITY:

The review of *Humanism as the Next Step* in the March—April issue of UNITY interests me more than you might expect. After reading a number of reviews of this book and after receiving a large number of relevant letters from a wide range of individuals—including Archibald MacLeish, Stuart Chase, Bonaro Overstreet, James P. Warbasse, Arthur Bentley, Robert Risk, and others less known—for the first time I felt a lack of impartiality and objectivity in the comments made by the reviewer.

Mr. Harold P. Marley has a very remarkable first paragraph. In the book, it is made perfectly clear that Humanism is spoken of as a "Third Way" in Europe, whereas in this country such a label has rarely, if ever, been applied. The review speaks of "Humanism's Four Facts," whereas in the book we speak of "several facts about this . . . . ." In the review there is reference to "*the* Seven Ideas," whereas in the book we speak of "certain specific ideas which have gone into the making of modern Humanism." In the review there is reference to "the Six Basic Beliefs," whereas in the book we refer to these as some points upon which there is general agreement. The review refers to "the Nine Activities," whereas in the book we speak of "some of the activities in which many Humanists are now at work." The review refers to "the Four Principles," whereas in the book we merely say: "Let us pause for a moment and consider four principles which underlie social action." The review refers to "the Five Fundamentals" which turn out in the book to be the Fifth Resolution passed at the First International Congress on Humanism and Ethical Culture, held in Amsterdam in 1952. The review refers to "the Seven Questions" which in the book are introduced by: "It is with some reluctance that we offer still another set of questions." The review by taking some of the above statements out of context makes the book to appear dogmatic, categorized, and even possibly ludicrous.

In the reviewer's second paragraph, it sounds as if we sought an endorsement for our views. Inasmuch as the humanist viewpoint is growing in acceptance, it is slighting to talk about "respectable company."

The reviewer is entitled to his opinion that the "shortcoming of the book is really the failure of Humanism itself, viz., its reliance upon wordy statements in lieu of specific achievements." Fortunately there are Humanists at work in many aspects of human endeavor and I am one who sincerely hopes that the day will never arrive when it will be more meaningful to label any forward-looking social action as exclusively humanistic.

In the reviewer's next paragraph, he states: "The omission of the name of Corliss Lamont from the discussion on American understanding of Russia is a strange oversight indeed." Inasmuch as no names were used as to those promoting American-Russian understanding, I do not understand how the absence of Mr. Lamont's name was an omission. In fact, I do not know whether Corliss Lamont entirely shares the view expressed in my book. It might be pointed out that Lamont's excellent book on Humanism is recommended in our book as "a fine general survey" of Humanism.

Because of the fact that so many readers of UNITY are Humanists, or near Humanists, it is regrettable that this snide and misleading review, which will discourage reading of the book, should appear in your pages.

LLOYD MORAIN.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

ANNUAL MEETINGS A SUCCESS

The 102nd Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference, held in St. Louis April 30 to May 2, were an outstanding success. There were 92 delegates from 47 member organizations and a total of 137 paid registrations. These are the official figures although there were others who attended various parts of the program.

The speakers maintained the high standards for which these annual Conference sessions have been noted. Bonaro Overstreet, E. T. Buehrer, Thomas Eliot, and Raymond B. Bragg all gave stimulating addresses. The joint meetings with the American Ethical Union were both enjoyable and valuable. Harry A. Overstreet spoke at the joint open lecture held in Sheldon Memorial. An outstanding panel of Ethical Union and Unitarian leaders packed the First Unitarian Church for that joint session. This was followed by a buffet luncheon.

Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, Mr. Elmer Pounds, and the members of the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis are to be congratulated and thanked for the excellence of their program and hospitality.

BY-LAW REVISION

With but two minor changes the By-Law revision (Art. V, Sec. 4) on the Committee on Resolutions, published in the January-February, 1954, issue of UNITY was passed. The effect of this is that resolutions to be considered at the Annual Meeting must be in the hands of the Secretary sixty days prior to the meeting; that they should be considered by the Committee on Resolutions and mailed to the member organizations thirty days prior thereto, and that other resolutions may be considered only "if the matters of concern in said resolutions have arisen since the expiration of the sixty-day time limit" and upon a three-fourths vote of the delegates present and voting.

NEW BOARD MEMBERS

Mrs. Christian Andreason, Springfield, Illinois; Rev. Hurley Begun, Colorado Springs, Colorado, and Rev. Lewis McGee, Yellow Springs, Ohio, were nominated and elected to the Board of Directors for terms of four years. They filled places vacated by Dr. E. Burdette Backus and Rev. Kenneth C. Walker. Mr. McGee was filling an unexpired term and thus eligible for re-election.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Conference voted that a letter of sympathy be composed by Dr. C. W. Reese and sent to the family of the late Mrs. Samuel A. Eliot.

Several recommendations were voted and referred to the Board of Directors. They were:

1. That a committee be appointed to find ways and means of further cooperation with the American Ethical Union.
2. That a committee be appointed to explore ways and means for a more direct participation of the churches in the financial support of the Conference.
3. That a committee be appointed to explore the possibility of providing more and new service materials for our churches and fellowships.
4. That consideration be given to holding the Annual Meetings earlier in April.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Dr. C. W. Reese, Treasurer, reported income on investments of approximately 6½ per cent. He also reported capital gains of some $16,500.

MEETING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors held a brief meeting Sunday morning, May 2, 1954. The Board approved an agreement made by the Secretary with the First Unitarian Church of Geneseo, Illinois. The agreement called for the assets of the Geneseo church to be given to the Western Unitarian Conference, the Conference to establish memorials in the name of the Geneseo church, and a contribution to be given to the endowment fund of the Unitarian Service Committee. These total $5,000. The balance of the assets, $16,350, is to be held by the Conference for twenty years as the Geneseo Fund, with the income going for the general purposes of the Conference.

Provision was made for the continuation of the Radio-TV Survey Committee. I. J. Domas of Lincoln, Nebraska, is the chairman. John W. Cyrus and John W. Brigham are the other members of the committee.

The Board approved a pilot project in church extension for the Chicago area and authorized the Executive Committee to take such action as necessary to further its activities. The members of the committee are Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, chairman; Ashley Hale, G. Richard Kuch, and Wallace W. Robbins.

By the action of the Board the Executive Committee consists of E. T. Buehrer, President; Leslie T. Pennington, Vice-President; Curtis W. Reese, Treasurer; Randall S. Hilton, Secretary; Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., and Frank Schramm.

The resignation from the Board of Mrs. Robert Dubin, Urbana, Illinois, was presented. It was accepted with regret and the expression of appreciation for her services. The Dubin family is moving to Eugene, Oregon, where Mr. Dubin will head the Department of Sociology of the University of Oregon.

For the past several years the United Unitarian Appeal campaign has been conducted on a regional basis, and the Appeal has guaranteed the allocation to the regional budgets. This policy has been challenged. The Board of the Conference was unanimous in going on record as "being definitely and unalterably opposed to any change in the plan of the United Unitarian Appeal for guaranteeing the budgets of the regions."

Since time had run out, the Board referred the appointment of committees recommended by the Conference to the President and the Executive Committee.

A.U.A. MAY MEETINGS

Rev. Arthur Foote, St. Paul, Minnesota, and Mr. Frank Schramm, Burlington, Iowa, were elected to the Board of the American Unitarian Association at the Annual Meeting, May 25. Other Western Conference members of the A.U.A. Board are Mrs. George Pieksen, St. Louis; Dr. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, and

Rev. John W. Cyrus, Omaha. All board members serve on one or more A.U.A. committees. Dr Pullman serves as chairman of the Council of the Division of Churches. John Cyrus is chairman of the Committee for the Department of Ministry. Several persons from the Western Conference, not members of the board, have been appointed by the board to various board committees. These include Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Indianapolis (All Souls), Council of the Division of Publications; Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago, chairman of Editorial Advisory Board for the Beacon Press; J. Bryan Allin, Chicago, member of Editorial Advisory Board for the Beacon Press; Dr. Sidney Mead and Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago, members of the Editorial Advisory Board for the Denominational Book Press, and Rev. Carl A. Storm, Minneapolis, member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the Pamphlet Commission.

The By-Laws of the Association were amended to provide the same procedures for the nomination and election of the Unitarian members of the Council of Liberal Churches that apply to Moderator, Vice-Presidents, Directors, etc., of the American Unitarian Association.

Resolutions were passed urging Congress to adopt rules of procedures for investigation committees which would be in accord with the spirit of the Constitution; upholding the 5th amendment as "a fundamental and long established safeguard to individual rights"; concerning opposition to the California loyalty oath law for churches; and in support of the Supreme Court decision on segregation in the public schools. The resolution against legalization of wire-tapping was presented for hearing. It was heard and passed.

It is impossible for one person to take in all of the attractions at these meetings. Speakers who made special and noteworthy contributions heard by this reporter include Dr. George Stoddard at the Unitarian Service Committee Dinner; Mrs. Agnes Meyer, at the Ware Lecture, and Mr. Emmett McLoughlin, author of *The People's Padre,* at the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. At the banquet Tuesday evening, presided over by Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, the Unitarian Award for 1954 was presented to Dr. John Haynes Holmes.

MEADVILLE COMMENCEMENT

The 109th Commencement of the Meadville Theological School was held Tuesday, June 8, 1954. The members of the graduating class were Jay Chidsey, William G. Horton, John Trowbridge, and Clark D. Wells. The commencement address was given by Prof. Sidney E. Mead of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago.

ROCKFORD INSTALLATION

Rev. Victor Goff was installed as minister of the Rockford, Illinois, Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Sunday, June 6. Dr. Curtis W. Reese gave the installation sermon. Rev. Randall S. Hilton welcomed Mr. Goff to the Western Unitarian Conference. The welcome to the community was extended by Rabbi Saul Appelbaum, and the benediction was given by Dr. Charles Parker Connolly, Minister Emeritus. Mr. David Connolly, chairman of the Pulpit Committee, gave the charges to the congregation and the minister.

FREE RELIGIOUS FELLOWSHIP

The Free Religious Fellowship of Chicago, now to be known as All Souls Unitarian Church, has called the Rev. Ben Richardson to become its minister. Mr. Richardson will take up his new duties on September 1, 1954. For the past three years he has been the Director of Beacon House, a settlement house on Chicago's near west side. Mr. Richardson is a graduate of Harvard Divinity School.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

Donald Stout, who has served as assistant minister of the First Unitarian church here this past year, has announced that he is going to Toronto to be minister of the two fellowships in that city, founded by the Unitarian Church there.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Prof. John C. Kidneigh, Director of the School of Social Work of the University of Minnesota and an active Unitarian layman, has gone to Korea to help initiate the social work training program in that country. This is a project jointly sponsored by the Unitarian Service Committee and the Ministries of Social Welfare and Education of the Korean Government.

SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Over 100 people were at the dinner served Sunday, May 23, for members of the radio audience. Delegations came from as far as Sioux Falls, S. Dakota, and Willmar, Minnesota.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION

In pursuance of instructions by the Board, the Executive Committee met on June 7. It appointed the following committees:

Committee on Cooperation with the American Ethical Union, temporary appointment: Thaddeus B. Clark and Randall S. Hilton.

Committee on Increasing the Financial Support of the Conference: Frank Schramm, chairman; Curtis W. Reese, and C. David Connolly.

Committee on New Service Materials: Vincent B. Silliman, chairman; John Fordon, Max D. Gaebler, and Mrs. Perrin B. Root.

ANNUAL MEETING 1955

By action of the Executive Committee, the Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held in Des Moines, Iowa, April 22-24, 1955.

UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL

Area	*Gave in '53*	*Gave in '54*	*% Increase*
Iowa Association	$ 3,775	$ 4,651	+23.2
Minnesota	3,632	4,400	+21.1
Chicago Area	4,852	5,829	+18.
Ohio Valley	6,012	6,783	+12.8
Abraham Lincoln	6,382	7,053	+10.5
Michigan Area	6,597	7,111	+ 7.8
Rocky Mountain Area	1,448	1,362	− 5.9
Unassigned	1,242	603	−51.4
Special Gifts	1,570	1,447	− 7.9
Total	$35,510	$39,239	+10.5

	1953	*1954*
Number of churches making or exceeding goal	17	23
Number of churches increasing contributions	30	37

Total raised by Appeal this year—$246,000
Goal for next year—$369,000.